DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 868 HE 017 591

AUTHOR Dohrmann, Marcia
TITLE Why Women Are Underrepresented in Administrative Positions: A Review of the Research.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Administrator Selection; *Employment Practices; *Females; Higher Education; *Leadership Styles; Organizational Climate; Personnel Policy; Power Structure; Promotion (Occupational); *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Networks
IDENTIFIERS *Women Administrators

ABSTRACT

Research investigating why women are underrepresented in college and private organizational administrative positions is reviewed. It was found that the differential rate of women in administrative positions is not due to their lack of proper credentials. Other reasons that have been cited are: typical female characteristics make it impossible for women to be effective in a leadership position; sex-role stereotypical attitudes cause discriminatory behavior; and the structure of organizations forms a barrier to the entry and advancement of women. In studying the proposition that "female" characteristics hinder women in leadership positions, most research has dealt with the measurement of leadership styles, with attention to consideration towards followers and initiation of task structure. Leadership styles and attitudes of women in traditional and nontraditional occupations have been compared. Some research has considered the effect of sex-role sterotyping on personnel decisions, leadership style, and discriminatory hiring practices. The way that the organizational structure itself can form barriers on job entry and advancement of women has been studied with special attention to informal "old boys" information networks and informal power networks. Implications and possible solutions to women's underrepresentation as administrators are noted. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED247868

WHY WOMEN ARE UNDERREPRESENTED IN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS: A REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

by

Marcia Dohrmann

HE 017 591

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marcia Dohrmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Copyright © by

MARCIA DOHRMANN

1982

All Rights Reserved

The purpose of this paper is to examine the research that has been done on why women are underrepresented in administrative positions. The original intent was to look at administrative positions in higher education only, however, the scarcity of research on this topic in institutions of higher education has led to the inclusion of all types of organizational settings in this paper.

Although women are 22% of all managers and administrators in the United States, the number of women managers is not proportionate to the number of women in the work force.[1] Most female managers are in occupational fields that are traditionally female, such as health administration, general office management, and restaurant management. In the business/industrial complex, women constitute only 5% of the middle management and 1% of the top management. Only fifteen women, compared to 2,500 men, head major corporations.[2] One reason given in the past for the small number of women in management was that women are not choosing management as a career because it was inconsistent with their self-image. Another reason frequently given was that women simply lacked the appropriate skills and experience to be hired for or promoted into management positions. These claims are no longer valid because "A study of enrollment patterns in the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business reveals that the 61% increase in total MBA enrollment from 1972-1977 was largely caused by a 338% female enrollment increase."[3] Women now comprise 20% of MBA enrollments.[4]

As the lack of qualified women for management positions can no longer be a viable argument, various other reasons have been given for this phenomenon. The types of studies that have been done reflect the approach that was thought to be the most relevant to the issue. A review of the research has yielded three basic approaches to this problem:

1. Women and men have different characteristics. The role of administrator requires certain characteristics, and these characteristics happen to be compatible to the typical "male" characteristics. "Female" characteristics render women unable to perform effectively as a leader in a management or administrative position. Men and women have different leadership styles and leadership styles are influenced by sex role characteristics. The solution in this situation is to have special training programs for women to teach them how to "think male" and develop a masculine leadership style.
2. Sex-role stereotypes form barriers to women's entry and promotion in organizations. Because of sex-role stereotypic attitudes, women are not hired or selected for promotion. Once hired, they are given differential treatment. Sex-role stereotypes have been internalized by women, and these act as psychological or "intrapsychic" barriers to their own advancement. Studies have been done relating sex-role stereotypical attitudes to evaluations of male and female managers. No specific solutions have been advocated.
3. The organizational structure itself forms a barrier to the entry and advancement of women through informal information

networks such as the "old boys" network, and informal power networks. The lack of female role models and the lack of mentors for aspiring female managers were also included as barriers. As a solution, special training programs for women to teach them about informal power and information networks are advocated. Women are also urged to form their own power and information networks. Existing female managers are encouraged to become mentors and act as role models. Very few of the studies done so far could be generalized to a general population because either a simple random sample was not used, or they lacked proper controls, or there was no control group.

A study that speaks directly to the assumptions in the first approach,that men and women have different leadership styles, is one done by Milner, King and Pizzini in 1979.[5] This looks at the relationship between sex of the administrator and leadership behavior in departments of physical education at the college and university level. To do this, Milner et al. used a modified version of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, developed by the Ohio State University leadership study, and modified by Halpin and Winer.[6] The instrument measures two factorially defined aspects of perceived leadership behavior: consideration and initiation of structure. Consideration was defined as "Behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his/her staff." Initiation of structure was defined as "Leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself/herself and members of the work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure."[7]

This study compared perceptions of actual and ideal leadership behaviors of male and female department heads as described by themselves and their faculty of both sexes. Both sexually segregated and integrated physical education departments were studied. Four department types were looked at - (1) segregated departments with male department head; (2) segregated departments with female department head; (3) integrated departments with male department head; and (4) integrated departments with female department head.[8]

It was found that men and women department heads perceive ideal leadership in the same way. Both male and female department heads perceived their actual leadership behavior in a similar way.[9]

In the faculty assessment of the leadership behavior of their department heads, a sexual bias emerged. There was a tendency for faculty members of one sex to perceive their department head as exhibiting more consideration behavior if the head was of the same sex. Women faculty perceived a higher degree of initiation behavior among female heads than the male faculty perceived of male heads. Male faculty also perceived a higher degree of initiation behavior among female heads than among male heads.[10] This is noteworthy because consideration behavior is usually seen as a female sex-role characteristic, whereas initiation behavior is seen as a male sex-role characteristic.

It is concluded that "There is no evidence that persons of either sex are better suited to perform leadership functions in different types of departmental structures. It appears that the training and selection of candidates for administrative positions should be based on their abilities and qualities alone, without regard to sex."[11] In the same

vein, a study done by Petty and Lee showed that male subordinates of female leaders perceived their leaders as lower in consideration and higher in initiating structure than did female subordinates of female leaders.[12] Petty and Miles found that job satisfaction with the supervisor was more closely associated with consideration behavior when the leader was female. Job satisfaction with the supervisor was more closely associated with initiating structure when the leader was male.[13]

Other studies have come to different conclusions, such as the Hennig and Jardin study, which concluded that "Corporate leaders must understand that corporate settings automatically favor men, and that if women are to compete equally, they must be given the opportunity to learn what their male colleagues have often learned automatically . . . which can enable women to make up for the set of differences . . . in perception, knowledge and skills, which so directly affects their success."[14] Hennig and Jardin seem to be implying that men and women have different characteristics and that the job of administrator requires masculine characteristics. They advocate that women be trained to "be more like men" so that they can be better managers. However, they do give women the benefit of the doubt by stating that men and women behave differently in the working world because of socialization. There are four main characteristics found by Hennig and Jardin, as stated by Kulczycky, that they found to be holding women back. These are being included here because they seem to be valid issues that are worthy of further investigation:

"1. Women emphasize self-improvement and ignore the organizational environment as a critical factor determining career advancement. They ignore the informal system of relationships and information sharing, ties of loyalty and of dependence, favors granted and owed.

2. Men integrate personal goals and career goals, setting one as dependent upon the other. Women separate their personal goals and career goals. They attempt to manage both without making any tradeoffs in either.

3. Men pattern management style according to the expectations of their bosses. Women pattern their management styles on their own concept of themselves. Men see friendships as a valued outcome of interactions on the job. For women, friendship is often a prerequisite for interaction on the job.

4. Men's claims and ambitions are seen as legitimate; women constantly have to prove themselves."[15]

Measuring subordinates' job satisfaction and job performance under both male and female leaders is another way of assessing whether or not men and women are effective leaders. Communication style is an aspect of leadership style. Hyman discusses the book Styles of Management and Communication: A Comprehensive Study of Men and Women by John Baird and Patricia Bradley. They found that both men and women managers were above average in communicating ". . . comfortableness, friendliness, and expressions of approval to their subordinates,"[16] but that men and women managers do communicate differently. Males were more dominant in their conversations with subordinates, quicker to challenge, and they directed the course of the conversation more. Female managers supplied more information to subordinates, and were more receptive to ideas. Female managers were seen by both male and female subordinates as better communicators than male managers. Both male and female subordinates' job satisfaction and morale were lower when they were supervised by male managers.[17]

Donnell and Hall see the real issue as being ". . . whether women whose career choice is management do in fact manage differently from their male counterparts."[18] They studied five dimensions of the management process over a two year period. In this exploratory study, they systematically compared the practices of 950 females with 966 males. They studied managers of more than 50 types of organizations with varied technologies.[19]

The five dimensions of managerial achievement they studied are as follows: (1) managerial philosophy; (2) motivational dynamics - the manager's own motivational needs, the way these affect the management of incentives, and the consequent effects on subordinate motivation; (3) participative practices; (4) interpersonal competence - the ability to deal honestly and effectively in managerial transactions; (5) managerial style.[20] Both males and females in the study were compared on these five dimensions. They used a matched sample design. Subjects were matched according to age, rank in the organization, organization type, and number of people supervised. However, they accepted two of the four categories as a match as long as one of the two was either age or rank. Some females were matched with one male on one measure and a different male on another measure. This is actually five different studies.[21]

Donnell and Hall developed a Managerial Achievement Quotient, which measures an individual's potential upward mobility within the organization. Each individual was grouped according to their Managerial Achievement Quotient (MAQ).

To analyze the data they used multivariate analysis of variance. Subjects were grouped by sex and achievement. When they found differences attributed to sex or sex by achievement, they used discriminant function analysis.[22]

On the managerial philosophy dimension, the Managerial Philosophy Scale (MPS) was administered to 239 male and 239 female managers. The two MPS scores indicate the strength of an individual's subscription to both McGregor's theory X and theory Y. It was found that no significant differences exist between the males' and females' managerial philosophy. Overall, it was found that low achievers subscribe to McGregor's theory X - people are basically lazy and need direction. Average achievers subscribe to a similar philosophy. High achievers subscribe to McGregor's theory Y - people are creative and self-motivated. However, slow and average achieving females showed significantly lower subscription to theory X beliefs than low and average achieving males. High achieving males and females did not differ.

On the motivation to work dimension (motivational dynamics), three things were looked at: (1) the motivational profiles of the managers, (2) the managers' approach to employee motivation, and (3) the motivational profiles of their subordinates. They combined Herzberg's Hygiene-Motivator theory and Maslow's Needs Hierarchy Concept. High achievers were found to be motivator-oriented and to exhibit stronger self-actualization needs and lower basic and safety needs than average and low achievers.

There were differences in the motivational profiles of male and female managers. The women were found to have lower basic needs and higher needs for self-actualization. In general, ". . . female managers

are more concerned with opportunities for growth, autonomy, and challenge. They are less concerned with work environment, pay, and strain avoidance. The male-female differences in personal motivation occur primarily among average achievers, the profiles of high achievers did not differ, nor did those of low achievers."[23]

To measure the manager's theories about what motivates others, Donnell and Hall administered the Management of Motives Index (MMI). It was found that ". . . males and females approach the management of incentives in pretty much the same way, emphasizing the same goals and promoting the same values."[24]

Another index, the Work Motivation Index, was used to examine the work motivation among subordinates. No overall differences were found in the profiles of the subordinates of female managers versus the subordinates of male managers. It was found that subordinates of females, however, have lower basic needs than the subordinates of males.

For the participation dimension, 234 subordinates of females and 240 subordinates of males were studied. It was found that ". . . male and female managers employ participative practices in a similar fashion and obtain similar results from their subordinates."[25] This is interesting in light of the findings on consideration and initiation previously reported in this text.

On the interpersonal competence dimension, Donnell and Hall claim that the quality of the manager-subordinate relationship comes from the level of interpersonal competence of the manager. Interpersonal competence depends on maximum utilization of two behavioral processes, exposure and feedback. They measured the manager's use of exposure with

superiors, colleagues, and subordinates using the Personnel Relations Survey (PRS), which they developed. It is based on the Johari Window Model by Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham.[26]

An overall difference was found between male and female managers in their use of the interpersonal process. The difference found was that the females were less willing to share relevant data with their colleagues. This appears to conflict with what was found by Baird and Bradley, that female managers shared more information with their subordinates. Perhaps female managers share more information with their subordinates while sharing less with their colleagues.

The Management Relations Survey, a companion to the PRS, was administered to 428 subordinates of 185 females and to 504 subordinates of 185 males. The sex of the subordinates was not known. The subordinates were asked to assess their managers' interpersonal practices and to report on their own use of interpersonal processes with the same managers. It was found that the managers' interpersonal practices did not differ by sex or according to sex by achievement. Subordinates solicited less feedback from female managers than the subordinates of male managers. It was deduced from this that subordinates relate differently to male managers than to female managers.[27]

For the management style dimension, Donnell and Hall used the Styles of Management Inventory (SMI) based on the Blake-Mouton managerial grid model.[28] There are five managerial styles in the grid model - 9/9, maximum concern for both task and people; 5/5, moderate concern for both task and people; 9/1, maximum concern for task at the expense of people; 1/9, maximum concern for people at the expense of task; and 1/1, minimum concern for either task or people. This SMI was

administered to 227 matched pairs of managers. It was found that "Male and female managers do not differ in the way they manage the organization's technical and human resources."[29]

Overall, only two differences were found between male and female managers: (1) female work motivation profiles are more "achieving," and (2) male managers are more open and candid with their colleagues than are females. Donnell and Hall conclude that the way management is practiced is not related to the sex of the manager.[30]

Like Donnell and Hall, Moore and Rickel were also interested in achievement motivation. They hypothesized that achievement motivation varies as a function of occupational setting, so women who aspire to non-traditional settings have a higher achievement motivation than women who choose the more traditional occupational settings. Four other hypotheses were examined in their study: (1) Women functioning in non-traditional roles and higher occupational levels will express greater job involvement attitudes. (2) Women who function in non-traditional settings or lower management levels will score higher on the management style of structure and production emphasis than on consideration. Women functioning in a more traditional setting or higher management position will score higher on consideration. (3) Women who aspire to and function in non-traditional occupational settings will be more accepting of "masculine" sex-role traits than women who aspire to traditional roles. (4) Women who function in non-traditional roles at higher management levels will more resemble biographical and attitudinal characteristics of typical male managers than women in traditional settings.[31]

This is another study in which the "myth of the male manager" is pervasive. It has been assumed that the role of manager is a role that requires the "typical" masculine characteristics to fill. This is especially true of hypothesis (3) and (4).

The subjects for this study were 303 women, 156 in nursing, a traditional occupation, and 147 in business and industry, non-traditional occupations. Subjects were from the Detroit area. The subjects were matched according to age and education across three occupational levels: (1) the second supervisory level, (2) the first supervisory level, and (3) non-supervisory positions. The nursing sample had 52 women at each level. The business and industry sample had 49 women at each level.[32]

Each subject completed a questionnaire containing five different measures: (1) an achievement motivation measure, (2) a job involvement measure, (3) a measure of management styles, (4) a sex-role identification measure, and (5) a biographical and attitudinal measure.[33]

The two career categories and the three occupational levels formed a 2 x 3 factoral design. Organizational setting and occupational level were the two independent variables. There were eight dependent variables which were analyzed by multivariate analysis of variance.

On the achievement motive variable, women from the non-traditional settings and women from the higher occupational levels scored significantly higher on achievement motivation than did women from traditional settings and lower occupational levels. The job involvement index did not vary significantly with either organizational setting or occupational level.

In the consideration aspect of management styles, the effect of organizational setting was significant at two occupational levels, the first supervisory level and the non-supervisory level. At the first supervisory level, the non-traditionals described themselves as more considerate than the traditionals (who were head nurses). At the non-supervisory level, the traditionals described themselves as more considerate than the non-traditionals.[34]

Significant differences were found on the Production Emphasis Scale of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire[35] with both of the independent variables. In the organizational setting, the non-traditionals scored significantly higher on production emphasis than the traditionals. The occupational level was significant only in the non-traditional group. The supervisors scored higher than the non-supervisory staff. It seems that this variable is situational and that it has nothing to do with aspirations.

For the sex-role identification measure, a self-descriptive index was used. It had three types of items: (1) forty-one items which have been found to be characteristic of managers and men, (2) nineteen items which were less characteristic of managers and men, and (3) seven items more characteristic of managers and women. Each respondent described herself on a five point scale from "characteristic of me" to "not characteristic of me."[36] There is a problem with this index in that it makes stereotypical assumptions about sex-role characteristics which will probably lend biased results.

On the items "more like men and managers" there were significant differences found for both independent variables. Women in non-traditional and higher level positions are more likely to describe themselves

as having characteristics like those of men. The women at the higher occupational levels saw themselves as being more like men than women at lower occupational levels. Women employed in the traditional occupations scored high on the index that said they were less like men and managers. Women at lower occupational levels scored higher on this than women at higher occupational levels.

On the "more like managers and women" index, a significant difference was found only with occupational level. The higher the occupational level, the less likely women were to identify with these characteristics. No significant difference was found between the traditional and non-traditional occupational settings. It was deduced that ". . . the non-traditionals have not rejected useful feminine behaviors, but have simply redefined their role to include behaviors appropriate to both sexes."[37] This appears to be a weak rationalization given to support a biased instrument.

On the biographical and attitudinal variables, Moore and Rickel found that the women in business and industry spent significantly more time in their organization than the nurses, and supervised fewer employees. The business women saw the domestic role as less important than the nurses and had fewer children living at home. The variables did not differ significantly across occupational levels.

Muldrew and Bayton claim that there are ". . . patterns of processes that mediate the performance of a specific managerial task."[38] The purpose of their study is to find the answer to three questions - (1) whether there are differences between male and female executives within an array of decision task variables, (2) whether any pattern

within the set of the eleven variables best relates to accuracy in making the managerial decisions, and (3) if there is such a pattern, if it is different for male and female executives.[39]

The task in this study was to make a "correct" personnel promotion decision. The variables represent three psychological domains; (1) decision task: decision latency, amount of information used, importance attached to items of information, items reviewed per minute, decision confidence, and decision flexibility; (2) personality variables: dogmatism and risk-taking; and (3) sex-role differences.

The subjects were 100 male executives and 100 female executives working in federal agencies in the Washington, D.C., area. All were the same pay grade with comparable responsibilities. All subjects had held their current position for at least five years. Participation in the study involved an interview and completion of four questionnaires. All instruments were administered individually.

For the decision task, the subjects were given a personnel decision simulation task which was a modification of the "Manual for the Personnel Decision Simulation," by R. N. Taylor.[40] The personality variables were measured on two scales: (1) "The 20-item short form of Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale,"[41] and (2) the "revised choice dilemmas questionnaire" by Kogan and Norris.[42] As a measure of sex-role perceptions, "the short version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974) was used. . . ."[43]

The two groups were not found to be significantly different in the level of accuracy in making the "correct" decision. There were no significant differences between the groups on any of the task-related variables. There were no significant differences in dogmatism, but the

women were more conservative in risk taking than the men. The female executives showed significantly more identification with the male role on the Personal Attributes Questionnaire than the men. This should cause one to speculate on the validity of the PAQ. The men and women did not differ significantly in their perceptions of male-female sex role differences.[44]

In the correlation among the variables, the task-based variable most related to decision accuracy was decision confidence. The highest correlation was between decision latency and items used per minute. In a stepwise regression analysis, the set of variables found to be related to decision accuracy included confidence, dogmatism, and decision latency. The sex of the executives was not a significant variable. The data indicates that 30% of the variance in decision accuracy was accounted for by confidence, dogmatism, and decision latency.[45]

Muldrow and Bayton conclude that the differences that occurred between the two groups reflect differences in patterns of mediating processes as these relate to the particular decision task - accuracy of selecting a candidate for promotion. The problem with this study is that exactly what is meant by "mediating processes" is never clearly explained. There is a vague reference to "descriptive" behavioral decision theory, which is defined as how individuals incorporate beliefs and values into their decisions.

In the personality and sex-role variables, the female executives as a group were less prone to take risks. The perceptions of the females as a group were androgynous. The women had stronger male sex role perceptions in male valued items than did the males, and stronger female

sex role perceptions on female valued items. There were no significant differences between the two groups on the seven decision-task variables.[46]

Most researchers who see men and women as having different leadership styles due to sex-role characteristics recommend that special training programs be held for women who desire to be managers. Brown says that the arguments for special training programs for women assume that the barriers to women's advancement in management are "intrapsychic." Women are seen as lacking the qualities necessary for an effective manager; character traits such as self-confidence, self-esteem, aggressiveness, dominance, emotional control, and sound judgment. "Compensatory education and self-improvement techniques are recommended to help individual women overcome their personal 'deficiencies' in terms of the managerial job market. . . . Women are seen as lacking these qualities because of differences from men in their training, socialization, or 'natural' disposition."[47] Putnam and Heinen are calling for an end to special training programs based on presumed sex differences and urge an androgynous approach to management training for both men and women.[48]

The second approach to this issue, that sex-role stereotypes form barriers to women's entry into management positions, is discussed by Andruskin and Howes. They state that women's attitudes toward themselves have been influenced by American culture, society, and tradition. Women have internalized these attitudes and they view themselves in a stereotypical way. The socialization process reinforces traditional roles and inhibits assertion, achievement and independence.[49] The purpose of their study was ". . . to identify and compare the attitudes of female and male administrators toward sex characteristics and sex-role

images and to examine the relationship between administrators' attitudes and their evaluation of women and men as administrators."[50] Sex characteristics are defined as those qualities usually associated with either a man or a woman. Sex-role images are defined as the expected behaviors of men and women in society and professions. Attitudes are defined as traditional (stereotypic) or non-traditional (non-stereotypic). Traditional attitudes exist when men are perceived to be aggressive, objective, competitive, and possessing more authority in decision-making. Women are traditionally seen as non-aggressive, submissive, dependent, and possessing less influence in decision-making. A non-traditional or liberal attitude exists when men and women were viewed as individuals without any particular role images ascribed to them.[51]

There were three research questions in this study: (1) what are the attitudes of men and women administrators toward sex characteristics and sex-role images; (2) what is the nature of evaluations made by women and men administrators about women and men administrators; and (3) what is the nature of the relationship between the attitudes of women and men administrators toward sex characteristics and sex-role images and their evaluations of women and men administrators.[52]

The population of the study consisted of men and women administrators in four top-level positions in five types of higher education institutions in ten states of the northeastern United States. One hundred forty-four institutions out of 293 were selected. Examples of the four top positions examined are president, vice president, academic dean, and dean of students. The five types of institutions were (1) private women's colleges, (2) private coeducational colleges, (3) public

coeducational colleges, (4) private coeducational universities, and (5) public coeducational universities. The actual sample consisted of 98 women and 86 men.

Two instruments were used: (1) A Survey of Attitudes towards Sex Role Differentiation, and (2) Evaluations of Administrators in Higher Education. The first instrument was adapted from one developed by Silver, Podemski and Engin. It consisted of 42 Likert items, 14 of which were statements relating to sex characteristics and 28 of which were statments relating to sex-role images.[53]

The second instrument was developed by Andruskin and Howes. It consisted of ten vignettes involving administrators in the administrative decision-making role. Three of the vignettes involved decisions about women. The subjects were asked to rate the decisions made by the administrator in each vignette. Half of the male and female subjects received a form with all male administrators, form I. The other half received a form with all female administrators, form II. It was a mail survey.[54]

For the first two research questions; frequencies, percentages and chi square statistics were used. For the third question, the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation statistic was computed. For all three questions, the .05 level of significance was used.

For the first question on attitudes toward sex characteristics and sex-role images, it was found that men and women held similar attitudes. Overall, the attitudes of the male and female subjects on the sex characteristics were liberal. The differences in attitudes were more in the degree to which male or female respondents held liberal attitudes.

The attitudes of male and female respondents toward sex-role images were also liberal. A difference existed in terms of the degree to which each group held nontraditional views; women being more liberal than men. Both groups seemed to disbelieve some of the traditional myths about women and to believe that women are capable of assuming responsible roles in the professions.[55]

For the Evaluations of Administrators in Higher Education instrument, three rating schemes were used to assess the decisions on the vignettes. These rating schemes were on quality, aggressiveness, and objectivity. Comparisons of the evaluations were made across form I and form II, across the male and female respondents, and across the three rating schemes. Seventy percent of the men and 77% of the women agreed on the evaluations they made of each vignette. Seventy-five percent of both groups agreed on the evaluations they made for each decision maker across the vignettes. It was concluded that sex was not a significant factor in the evaluation of a decision-maker's performance.[56]

Significant relationships were found between the sex characteristics of competitiveness and aggressiveness in evaluations of men and women administrators for both groups. For sex-role images, significant relationships were found between using sex titles, having equality in sex roles, and having female role-models. Over all, liberal non-traditional attitudes were related to equitable evaluations of men and women.[57]

Larwood, Wood and Inderlied also see the socialization process, in which women internalize social norms, as a barrier to women's entry into management positions. Discriminatory hiring practices are due to sex-role stereotypes which hold that ". . . women are expressive and warm,

but necessarily incompetent and incapable of conducting serious business."[58] They refer to "conflicting feminine and managerial role demands" as an internal barrier. This is usually known as a role conflict. The presence of men tends to emphasize this role conflict. External barriers exist when women are kept out of informal work groups and the informal communication network. They then have less access to those who might be evaluating them. These external barriers will be discussed here later in the third basic approach to this problem. Two solutions are offered for overcoming internal and external barriers: "Either men and women can come to understand one another well enough to forget their prior stereotypes, or a role model can be provided who can show women how to structure their activities and thinking so as to minimize their exposure to conflict without compromising their managerial effectiveness."[59]

Larwood et al. summarize that training women for managerial positions is different than training men for managerial positions because of the different socialization experiences women have had. There are four areas that should be emphasized in training women: (1) emphasis on the strategy needed to overcome conflicting role demands, (2) emphasis on making one's self a part of the rising "ingroup," (3) emphasis on the use of role models to demonsrate that management is appropriate and rewarding for women, and (4) the de-emphasis of sex roles and stereotypes through the restructuring of organizational and educational environments. They also suggest the development of programs that consider three main issues - (1) an end to stereotyping, (2) the provision of role-models, and (3) emphasis on pre-employment socialization. It is their view that the educational system

should find ways to overcome these barriers so that women can realize their full potential.[60]

Rice, Bender and Vitters examined the impact of leader sex roles and follower attitudes toward women on objective measures of group performance and group member perceptions. Four main issues were looked at in their study: (1) the importance of sex roles as a leadership variable, (2) sex bias in attributes, (3) construct validity of the Attitude Toward Women Scale, and (4) the importance of task variables as a determinant of group process and member perceptions.[61]

No clear evidence has been found so far on male versus female leadership effectiveness. It has been shown, however, that performance by females is often evaluated less favorably than identical levels of performance by males, by both male and female evaluators.[62] In looking at leadership processes, the traditional categories of leader behavior that have been studied are initiating structure and consideration. Research on these variables has not yielded any general patterns of behavior for male versus female leaders.

One main goal of the Rice et al. study was to assess the effects of leaders' sex on two measures of leadership effectiveness - group task performance and follower morale. A second goal was to explore possible difference in leadership processes of groups with male and female leaders. The measures of group processes are based on post-task questionnaire responses provided by leaders and followers.[63]

The subjects were 288 first year cadets at the U.S. Military Academy who were selected from the entire class of first year cadets. There were 72 four-person task groups. One half of the groups had female leaders. In

all groups, the three followers were males. All groups worked on a structured and unstructured task for thirty minutes each. Spence and Helmreich's (1972) Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) was used.[64] It was found that in one half of the groups, the followers had traditional attitudes toward women. In the other half, the followers had more liberal attitudes toward women. Group performance on the task was measured by objective scoring procedures.[65]

The measure used for team morale was Fiedler's (1967) Group Atmosphere (GA) questionnaire. This is a 10-item scale which requires subjects to describe the atmosphere of their group on a series of bipolar semantic differential scales.[66] The subjects were also asked to rate the extent to which these factors contribute to the performance of their group: (1) motivation of group members, (2) intelligence of leader, (3) leadership ability of the leader, (4) ability of members to be effective followers, (5) luck, (6) intelligence of followers, and (7) maturity of leader.[67]

The subjects were then asked to estimate what percent the performance of the leaders contributed to the groups' performance. The followers were also asked to evaluate sex factors as possible causes of the "leader's performance as a leader," ability to lead hard work, expert ability on the task, cooperation of followers, task difficulty and luck.[68]

To measure leader behavior, a ten item Leader Behavior Rating Scale (LBRS) was used. This scale measures the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. Five items were included in each dimension. For each LBRS item, the subjects were to rate the degree to which specific behaviors were characteristic of the leader during the task - very true, generally true, generally not true, or not at all true of the leader. The

scores of the five items in each dimension were summed to create the scale scores for consideration and initiating structure.[69]

"The study can be summarized as a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design with male or female leaders, conservative or more liberal follower attitudes toward women, and a structured and unstructured task. Leader sex and follower attitudes are between-group factors while task structure is a repeated measure factor since all groups worked on both tasks."[70]

"The main effect for leader sex indicated that groups with male leaders performed better than did groups with female leaders."[71] But what should be taken into account here is the populatin that was sampled - cadets in a military academy - in an institutional setting that has been traditionally male with all the traditional male values. Groups of followers with more liberal attitudes toward women performed better on the unstructured task. Groups with followers having traditional attitudes toward women performed better on the structured task. These results may indicate the perceived differences in the masculinity of the two tasks. The structured task was a drawing task, whch more fitted the masculine stereotype of a task of spatial arrangements. The unstructured task was a proposal task which included a written presentation of the group's ideas. These are sometimes linked to a female stereotype.

In performance, the objective measure of the structured task correlated with the subjective measures by both leaders and followers. On the unstructured task, leader perceptions of task success were unrelated to the objective measure of success. On the subjective reports of performance by leaders and followers, the task structure effect was significant for both leaders and followers. Both leaders and followers felt they did better on the structured task.

Both leaders and followers described the group atmosphere more favorably after the drawing task than after the proposal task.[72] Followers with more liberal attitudes toward women described the group atmosphere similarly, whether the leader was male or female. Followers with traditional attitudes toward women described the atmosphere more favorably when they had male leaders. Female leaders were seen to have made a greater contribution to the group's performance. The performance of male leaders was seen as a result of expert ability.

On leader behavior, followers with traditional attitudes toward women described their leaders, both male and female, as less considerate than followers with a more liberal attitude.[73] So follower attitudes were also an indication of perceived leadership processes on the consideration/initiation structure dimension regardless of the sex of the leader.

Followers with more liberal attitudes toward women claimed that female leaders initiated more structure than did male leaders. Followers with traditional attitudes rated male leaders higher than female leaders on initiating structure. Although groups with female leaders performed less effectively on the assigned tasks, ". . . only 3% of the variance in group performance could be accounted for by the leader's sex."[74]

Cohen and Leavengood are concerned with identifying the conditions under which differential treatment of males and females occur in employment settings. The study they conducted was an attempt to validate the Women as Managers Scale, as developed by Peters, Lerberg and Taynor.[75] They used an in-basket behavioral measure. Only male sujects were used. The subjects were 78 male students enrolled in upper level management courses at a state university.

The in-basket exercise was a modified version of the instrument developed by Rosen and Jerdee in 1974 to measure the influences of sex-role stereotypes on personnel decisions. The in-basket contained memoranda, each dealing with a specific supervisory or personnel problem. There were two types of memos and two types of discrimination that were measured - access and treatment. Access discrimination refers to the rejection of applicants for non-job related reasons. Treatment discrimination refers to invalid differential treatment of employees according to sex after they have gained access to the organization.[76]

For the access memos, the subjects had to make hiring decisions on four different candidates - two male and two female. For the treatment memos, the subjects had to make decisions concerning promotion, leave of absence, and disciplinary action. For each type of problem, there was a similar male and female stimulus person.

For each memo, the subject rated a number of alternatives from 1 (highly undesirable) to 5 (highly desirable). There were four scores for each subject - (1) female access discrimination, (2) male access discrimination, (3) female treatment discrimination, and (4) male treatment discrimination.

Females received significantly less favorable personnel decisions than males, in both access and treatment. There were significantly more favorable decisions made about the stimulus person, whether male or female, in the access situation than in the treatment situation. There was also a significant interaction between the sex of the stimulus person and the situation - the highest mean scores were found in the male access situation.[77]

The results indicate that male subjects do differentiate between male and female employees in certain situations. However, the WAMS scores were not associated with these differentiations. There were non-significant correlations between the WAMS raw scores and the dependent measures of access and treatment. Cohen and Leavengood question the validity of the WAMS in predicting real world behavioral decisions.[78]

Weber, Feldman and Poling say that there are three areas which contribute to the maldistribution of males and females in educational administration: (1) personal and social roles, (2) personal and family roles, and (3) discriminatory patterns in training, hiring, and promotion.[79] Personal and social roles are prescribed for women. Different characteristics are encouraged in males and females through social conditioning. The characteristics associated with the adult male role are dominance, achievement, autonomy, and aggression. These are also the personal characteristics that are valued in leaders. The characteristics associated with the adult female role are emotionalism, passivity, timidity, deference, and self-abasement. These characteristics are not acceptable for a person in a leadership position. Weber et al. state that some of the sex-role stereotypes are perpetuated by women themselves. They are socialized to internalize the traits that are incompatible with leadership roles.

There are personal and family constraints on women. They are socialized to experience achievement vicariously by supporting others. Because of this, a woman seeking a career will have conflicts over her family responsibilities. Past studies report that most female administrators and single. Among those who are married, few have young children. It is the opposite for male administrators.[80]

There are discrimination patterns in employment practice. About ninety-eight percent of the faculty in departments of educational administration are males. In 1975, ninety-two percent of all students in educational administration were males.[81] It is postulated that women are not encouraged by the educational system to become administrators. Most women who wish to have non-teaching careers in education are encouraged to become counselors or educational specialists. Most women who are administrators are in personnel/support positions, as opposed to decision-making and control positions.

There are differential rates of promotion for males and females in educational administration. In a study done in 1973 and confirmed in 1978, it was shown that male superintendents were unlikely to hire women as administrators, and that sex was the only variable that was significant in the hiring process. Women principals are usually older and have more experience than men before they are given their first administrative position. In a study done by the National Association of Elementary School Principals in 1979, it was found that sixty-five percent of the male respondents were appointed to the principalship before age 35. Only twenty-five percent of the women were appointed before the age of 35.[82]

The third approach to the problem as to why there are few women in managerial positions is the newest one. The least amount of research has been done in this area. This approach claims that the organizational structure itself forms a barrier to the entry and advancement of women. The arguments against special training for women are from this approach. Men and Women of the Corporation by Kanter is the best example of this theory. Kanter says that what appears to be sex differences in work behavior are really responses to structural conditions and to one's place in

the organization. Kanter says there are three types of structural restraints: (1) the proportion of female managers in the organization, (2) lack of access to power in the organization, and (3) limited opportunity in the organization due to the lack of access to informal networks.[83]

Bartol[84] suggests that differential behavior associated with females in leadership positions cannot account for significant amounts of the sex structuring of organizations. Sex structuring refers to the distribution of the sexes in the hierarchies of an organization. She developed an analytical framework for investigating the phenomenon of sex structuring. Schein's basic career stages and transition points were used to analyze the movement of women through these stages. These basic stages and transitions are the organization's filtering system. The stages and transitions are these: (1) pre-entry stage, entry transition; (2) basic training stage, initiation transition; (3) first regular assignment stage, with four sub-stages - (a) learning the job, (b) maximizing performance, (c) becoming obsolete and (d) learning new skills. The next transition is the promotion or leveling off transition.

The pre-entry stage ". . . involves the preparation, education, and socialization of women during the period before they seek employment."[85] The pre-entry stage processes contribute to the sex structuring of organizations by reducing the pool of qualified available women. Existing research indicates that females possessing credentials equivalent to males face selection discrimination at the entry point to the organization. Discrimination could take the form of blocking entry or of filtering women into traditional jobs. This is the entry transition period.

The second stage is the basic training stage. It is defined as "Role confusion; superior-subordinate distance; isolation."[86] In this stage, an interpersonal role-making process, or role negotiations, takes place between the new employee and her superior. If these role negotiations are unsuccessful, the trainee's movement across informal boundaries where one becomes privy to inside information and sponsorship will be inhibited.

The next transition point is initiation, or acceptance as a member of the organization. There are some traditional roles for women that lead to acceptance such as mother, seductress, and pet. There is evidence to suggest that displays of competence lead to non-acceptance or isolation. Current research indicates that the sex ratio of the work group affects acceptance.[87]

The first regular assignment is the third stage. It can result in possible tokenism or less challenging work. It has been found that there is reluctance to assign women to challenging positions. Different criteria is used to evaluate male versus female performance, and this leads to differential reinforcement.

The next transition point is promotion. If the female manager makes it past this barrier, the processes at stage three, or its substages, keep repeating themselves.

What the career stages and transitions do not explain is how some women are able to make it through these filtering processes and boundaries. Bartol suggests that some women make it because they have help from a group within the organization, or from marital and family ties. Others may make it because they have unique characteristics.[88]

Andruskin and Howes agree, based on their study discussed here earlier, that the structure of organizations is a possible barrier to women

seeking management positions. Some organizational characteristics that act as barriers are: the norm of organizational homgeneity, the use of nonability criteria for managerial selection and promotion, the workings of the informal network, and the differential use of the organizational reward system.[89] Organizational homogeneity is ". . . based on a belief that heterogeneity in managers and executives is harmful to an organization's stability and survival."[90] The nonability criteria usually used in selecting managers are ". . . an image of solid respectability, superficial presentability, and an ability to develop positive communion and social relations with co-workers. . . ."[91] These attributes are most often possessed by white men than by women and minorities.

Another factor that has been mentioned as a structural barrier to women in management is the "old boys network." This network is prevalent in educational institutions. According to Rosser, "Women miss out on superintendencies because they are not part of the national 'old boys network,' which recommends most of the people for the top jobs, especially in the larger school districts."[92]

Other school districts hire consulting firms or contact a professor in a graduate school of administration. These consultants and professors have a network of friends and acquaintances from whom they solicit recommendations. In order to even be considered, a person must know someone who will speak for her.[93]

Holly Knox, director of the Project on Equal Education Rights for the NOW Legal Defense and Education fund, calls this "back-room discrimination." She says that Title VII of the Public Health Service Act and Title IX of the Education Amendments are not being enforced.[94]

Rosser says some strategies that could change this situation are: women's networks, special training sessions, and becoming visible in male dominated organizations. She claims that if a woman is competent, has professional visibility and has a series of influential mentors, she will move through the system.[95] She does not explain what one does to become "visible," nor does she explain how one goes about obtaining willing and influential mentors. The suggestion that women form their own networks is a common one for those who take this approach.

Kanter is the main proponent of the structural approach. She is interested in ". . . how group structures shape interaction contexts and influence particular patterns of male-female interactions."[96] Variables such as ". . . position an opportunity and power structures account for a large number of phenomena related to work behavior that have been labeled 'sex differences'." She says that conclusions about "women's behavior" or "male attitudes" confuse the effect of situation with the effect of sex roles. Her main thesis is that ". . . groups with varying proportions of people of different social types differ qualitatively in dynamics and process."[97]

There are four types of groups: (1) uniform - only one kind of person, one significant social type. They are homogeneous in sex, race, or ethnicity. (2) Skewed - a group is skewed if ". . . there is a large preponderance of one type over another . . . ." The numerically dominant type controls the group and its culture. The few of the other type are called "tokens," because ". . . they are often treated as representatives of their category, as symbols rather than individuals."[98] The ratio of dominants to tokens is about 85:15. There is not enough of the

minority group for them to form an alliance to gain power. (3) Tilted - a group is tilted if there is a majority/minority ratio of 65:35. In this group, there are enough minority types that they can form an alliance and effect the culture of the group. (4) Balanced - a group is balanced if it has a ratio of from 60:40 to 50:50. The majority and minority turn into subgroups. Kanter focuses on the skewed group because ". . . it is the one encountered by large numbers of women in groups and organizations in which numerical distributions have traditionally favored men."[99]

Women often find themselves in the position of a token. Tokens ". . . are people identified by ascribed characteristics such as sex, race, religion, ethnic group, or other characteristics that carry with them a set of assumptions about culture, status, and behavior highly salient for majority category members."[100] The dynamics of tokenism operate whenever proportional representation in a group is highly skewed.

The "proportional rarity" of tokens generates three types of perceptual phenomena - visibility, polarization, and assimilation. Token group members are more visible because of their differentness. Polarization is defined as the exaggeration of differences. Dominant group members become more aware of their commonalities with each other and their differences from the tokens. In assimilation, the characteristics of a token are distorted to fit the stereotype of their social type.

Kanter did a field study of a major corporation in which she interviewed sixteen women in sales and distribution and over forty male peers and managers. She found that being highly visible put a lot of per-

formance pressure on the token women. Everything the saleswomen did was closely observed by their male peers and managers. The consequences of their actions were extended to other women in general. "Some women were told that their performance could affect the prospects for other women in the company."[101] Although the women were given extra attention, it was not geared toward their achievements or ability, but toward their physical appearance or their "discrepant characteristics." As a result, the women had to work extra hard to have their achievements noticed. Another form of performance pressure due to high visibility is fear of retaliation. The women were afraid of performing better than the dominants for fear of retaliation.

The tokens responded to performance pressures in two ways - over-achievement and attempts to limit their visibility. Kanter suggests that what has been called "fear of success" is actually fear of visibility.

Polarization sets the scenario for boundary heightening. Boundary heightening occurs when the presence of a token makes dominants more aware of what they have in common. At the same time, the token is perceived as a threat to that commonality. It is at the moment that a group feels threatened by change that its culture and bonds become evident to it. In response to this, the dominants tend to exaggerate their commonality and the token's differences, heightening the boundaries between them. There are four ways in which boundary heightening is accomplished - exaggeration of dominants' culture, interruptions as reminders of "difference," overt inhibition and loyalty tests.

The exaggeration of dominants' culture happens when the majority

members of the group exaggerate the cultural elements they share in contrast to the token. In Kanter's study, the male dominants in the sales training groups talked about their sexual adventures and told "prowess-oriented 'war stories'."[102]

Interruptions as reminders of "difference" happen when the dominants make the presence of the token an occasion for interrupting the flow of group events. For example, the males would ask the female token whether or not they could still swear in her presence. In this way, the token was let known that she was putting constraints on the group by her presence.

Overt inhibition occurs when dominants inhibit their activities in the presence of tokens. The setting of some of their activities is moved from public areas, to which the tokens have access, to private settings, where they can be excluded. In this manner, the tokens are isolated from informal events and activities of their work group. Thus, the women were not privy to the informal information and power networks. In some cases, the women did not know that their performance was under question by their managers until they were told to find a job outside of sales.[103]

Tokens are often given loyalty tests by the dominant group. Demonstrating loyalty to the dominant group may permit the token to be included in more informal activities. These loyalty tests usually require that the token identify with the dominants and turn against members of their own category. "For token women, the price of being one of the boys is a willingness to turn occasionally against the girls."[104]

Women are called upon to act in excluding other women on the basis that most women are incompetent; but <u>they</u> are exceptions.

Tokens have two response choices to boundary heightening - they can accept isolation or they can try to become insiders. If they accept isolation, they will become an audience for the expressive acts of dominants and will be excluded from informal socialization. To become insiders, they will have to prove their loyalty ". . . by defining themselves as exceptions and turning against their own social category."[105]

The perceptual tendency toward assimilation leads to role entrapment. Role entrapment refers to ". . . the distortion of the characteristics of tokens to fit pre-existing generalizations about their category."[106] One kind of role entrapment is status leveling. It occurs when others do not treat tokens according to their situational status, but insist on treating them according to their master status, or the expected position of the token's category. Master status refers to sex, race, and ethnicity. Kanter says this happens when tokens are in a profession in which their social category is a statistical rarity. For example, saleswomen were mistaken for secretaries in the office, and on the road for assistants, wives, or mistresses. Even when the true situational status was known, (saleswomen), others still tended to treat them as secretaries or wives. It is a leveling of their situational status to fit the perceptions of their master status.

The other kind of role entrapment is stereotyped role induction. This happens when the tokens are inducted into a stereotypical role by the dominants. Kanter observed four role traps - mother, seductress,

pet, and iron maiden. In the mother role, the woman is seen as a nurturer; sympathetic and a good listener. The role of mother has three negative aspects - (1) She has to remain noncritical and accepting, (2) she is rewarded only for her service to her male colleagues and not for independent acts, and (3) she is identified with emotional matters.

The role of seductress introduces sexual competition and jealousy among the men. She is seen as a sex object and all the men are vying for her attention. She is rewarded for her femaleness, but her sexuality blocks out other characteristics. In many instances, one man will adopt the role of protector toward an attractive woman. This causes resentment among the other men because he gains access to her by masking his own sexual interest.

The pet is a woman who is accepted into the group as a "cute little thing" that is taken along on group events to witness shows of male prowess. Displays of competence by her are fussed over because no one expects them of her. The same competent acts performed by men are taken for granted.

Women who refuse to be trapped into any of the other roles are inducted into the role of iron maiden. They are stereotyped as a tough or strong woman, especially if they display their competence and insist on their full rights in the group.

There are various responses of tokens to role entrapment. Most of them are conservative and low risk responses. It is too time-consuming to fight stereotyped roles, and more comfortable to just accept them. Kanter says, "Submissiveness, frivolity, or other attributes may be feigned by people who feel these are prescribed for them by the dominant organizational culture."[107]

Kanter concludes that relative numbers are important in shaping outcomes for disadvantaged individuals. Women need to be included in an organization in sufficient numbers to counteract the effects of tokenism. Otherwise the presence of tokens, instead of paving the way for others in their social category, may have the opposite effect. These things should be taken into account when assessing affirmative action quotas.[108]

The area of research concerned with the proportional scarcity of women in administrative positions is fairly new. It is not that the phenomenon did not exist before. It existed but it was not considered a problem. As more women joined the work force in the 1960s and 1970s it became apparent to women that most occupations were sexually typed and structured. Sexual structuring exists between occupations and within occupations. In the case of education, most women are teachers; while most administrators, superintendents and principals are men. Within the teaching profession itself, there is sexual structuring. Most women are elementary school teachers, while most high school teachers are men. There is also a differential rate of promotion for males and females. Women principals are usually older and have had more experience before they were promoted to their first administrative position. Rosser gives one reason for this as being the "old boys" network.

It has been shown that the differential rate of women in administrative positions is not due to their lack of proper credentials. Other reasons have been given for their underrepresentation. The three basic ones have been outlined here as being: (1) the typical "female" characteristics make it impossible for women to be effective in a leader-

ship position, (2) sex-role stereotypical attitudes cause discriminatory behavior, and (3) the structure of organizations forms a barrier to the entry and advancement of women.

In the first approach, that "female" characteristics hinder women in leadership positions, most research has dealt with the measurement of leadership styles using the consideration/initiation of structure dichotomy. Studies done by Milner, King, Pizzini and Petty and Lee have found women to be higher in initiation of structure than men. Moore and Rickel compared women in non-traditional occupations with women in traditional occupations. They found that on the second supervisory level, there was no difference on the consideration/initiation scores between the women in traditional occupations and women in non-traditional occupations.

It was also found by Milner, King and Pizzini that male and female administrators perceive ideal leadership behavior in the same way. Male and female department heads also perceived their actual leadership behavior in the same way. Donnell and Hall found no differences between male and female managers on managerial philosophy, the management of incentives or the way male and female managers managed technical and human resources. They found no differences between the work motivation of subordinates of male and female managers. Muldrow and Bayton found that male and female executives were not different in their accuracy in a decision-making task. They also found no differences between males and females on the dogmatism scale they used. They did find differences in risk-taking, with women being more conservative. Their male and female subjects did not differ on their perceptions of male-female sex-role differences.

Moore and Rickel did find that women in non-traditional occupational settings scored higher on achievement motivation than women in traditional occupational settings; however, women in higher level positions in both settings scored higher on achievement motivation than the women in lower-level positions in either setting. The women in non-traditional occupational settings probably scored higher because they were strongly motivated to fight harder against discriminatory barriers placedin their path. Moore and Rickel also found that women in non-traditional occupations were more likely to describe themselves as having characteristics "more like managers and men," but the instrument used might be biased because it appears to beg the question as to what male and female characteristics are and are not.

In the Hennig and Jardim article cited by Kulczycky, they say that women ". . . ignore the informal system of relationships and information sharing. . . ." Perhaps women do not ignore them, but are shut out from them, as Kanter, Bartol and Rosser suggest. Their statement that women keep their personal and career goals separate, managing both without any tradeoffs in either (emphasis added), is questionable. It is doubtful that statistical evidence could be found to confirm this. No concrete conclusions can be drawn from this approach to the problem because the evidence is contradictory.

The second approach, that sex-role stereotypes form external and internal barriers to women seeking management positions, seems to be valid. Andruskin and Howes found that men and women held similar attitudes toward sex characteristics and sex-role images - meaning that they both accept the same sex-role stereotypes. This should be the true

conclusion to their study, not the one they come to - that stereotypical attitudes do not influence evaluations of women. They forgot that they were working with a practically homogeneous group - over seventy percent of both their male and female subjects had liberal or non-stereotypical attitudes - hence both males and females agreed on the evaluation of the vignettes. Their suggestion that women have internalized sex-role stereotypes agrees with their results. Larwood, Wood and Inderlied also say that women internalize social norms; and that discriminatory hiring practices are due to sex-role stereotyping.

The Rice, Bender and Vetters study, which was classified as taking the second approach, also measured leadership behavior in terms of consideration and initiation of structure. They found that follower attitude was related to perceived (emphasis added) leadership style. Followers with liberal attitudes toward women thought that female leaders initiated more structure than male leaders. Followers with traditional attitudes toward women thought that male leaders initiated more structure. Although on the performance measure it was found that the groups with male leaders performed better, this is not a conclusion that can be generalized to the total population. Not only were all of the followers male, the population studied - military cadets studying at military academies - is the most traditionally masculine setting and occupation there is.

The subjects used by Cohen and Leavengood in their study were also all male. They found that their subjects were influenced by sex-role stereotypes when making personnel decisions. The males evaluated received more favorable treatment than females in personnel decisions. However, this study should be replicated before coming to any conclusions from it because

the scores from the Women As Managers Scale did not correlate with the dependent measures of access and treatment discrimination. They conclude that the WAMS is not valid, but perhaps there is an intervening variable that should be controlled for.

Weber, Feldman and Poling agree with an earlier stated position, that society prescribes different characteristics for males and females. These are learned through socialization. Women internalize these stereotypes, which causes them to have role conflicts.

For the third approach, that the structure of orginizations forms a barrier to women, Bartol says that the organization as a structure has a filtering system that filters out women at three basic career stages and transition periods. Rosser notes the prevalence of the "old boys" network in educational institutions. She says that women miss out on job openings because of lack of information. However, her suggestion that if women become more visible, it will help them fight the "old boys" network does not make sense in light of what Kanter has to say about the visibility of tokens. Being highly visible puts a lot of performance pressure on a person who is a proportional rarity. Kanter theorizes that group structure shapes interaction contexts, and structural positions within organizations, plus proportional rarity of social type, shape behavior.

Although Kanter's and Bartol's articles are basically theoretical, they are key in pointing out the direction that future research should take. Studies of leadership styles have yielded inconsistent results. Likewise, studies relating perception and evaluation are unclear.

The three approaches to the issue of why women are underrepresented in administrative positions outlined here somewhat overlap. For instance, the organizational barriers to women's entry and promotion within

organizations are formed by sex-role stereotypes. The first approach, that men and women have different sex-typed characteristics, is the result of years of socialization based on attitudes and beliefs. These attitudes and beliefs are internalized by women, and they affect their behavior. Discrimination does exist and it exists because of the belief that men and women have different sex-role characteristics, and that the characteristics of women render them incapable of holding leadership positions. There is only one barrier to women seeking administrative positions - sex-role stereotypical attitudes that lead to discriminatory behavior on the part of both men and women.

This does not mean that there is no need for further research. There is much need for further research on the ways in which these stereotypes can be broken. Perhaps special leadership training for women would be helpful. Perhaps there should be special classes on the effects of sex-role stereotyping for both males and females. Any learned behavior can be changed.

NOTES

[1]Linda Keller Brown, "Women and Business Management," Signs, 5, No. 2 (Winter, 1979), 267.

[2]Page 268.

[3]Page 270.

[4]Page 271.

[5]E. Keith Milner, Harry A. King, Edward L. Pizzini, "Relationships Between Sex and Leadership Behavior of Department Heads in Physical Education," Research in Higher Education, 10, No. 2 (1979), 113-121.

[6]Page 113.

[7]Page 114.

[8]Page 115.

[9]Page 118.

[10]Page 119.

[11]Pages 120-121.

[12]M. M. Petty and K. Lee, as cited by Kathryn M. Bartol, "The Sex Structuring of Organization: A Search for Possible Causes," Academy of Management Review, 3, No. 4 (October, 1978), p. 806.

[13]M. M. Petty and R. H. Miles, "Leader Sex-Roles Stereotyping in a Female-Dominated Work Culture," Personnel Psychology, 29 (1976), pp. 393-304, as cited by Bartol in Ibid., p. 809.

[14]M. Hennig and A. Jardim, The Managerial Woman, quoted by Maria Kulczycky, "Women at the Top - Why so Few?" in Savings and Loan News, 98, No. 6 (June , 1977), p. 73.

[15]Hennig and Jardim as cited by Kulczycky, pp. 69-70.

NOTES (continued)

[16]John Baird and Patricia Bradley, Styles of Management and Communication: A Comprehensive Study of Men and Women, as quoted by Beverly Hyman in "Responsive Leadership: The Woman Manager's Asset or Liability?" Supervisory Management, 25, No. 8 (August, 1980), p. 42.

[17]Pages 42-43.

[18]Susan M. Donnell and Jay Hall, "Men and Women as Managers: A Significant Case of No Significant Difference," Organizational Dynamics, 8, No. 4 (Spring, 1980), p. 61.

[19]Page 62.

[20]Pages 64-65.

[21]Page 65.

[22]Page 67.

[23]Page 71.

[24]Page 71.

[25]Page 73.

[26]Page 73.

[27]Page 74.

[28]Page 75.

[29]Page 75.

[30]Page 76.

[31]Loretta M. Moore and Annette U. Rickel, "Characteristics of Women in Traditional and Non-Traditional Managerial Roles," Personnel Psychology, 33, No. 2 (Summer, 1980), p. 321.

[32]Page 322.

NOTES (continued)

[33]Pages 322-323.

[34]Page 327.

[35]Form XII of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire as modified by Schriesheim and Kerr in 1974, from Moore and Rickel, p. 323.

[36]Moore and Rickel, p. 323.

[37]Page 329.

[38]Tressie Muldrow and James Bayton, "Men and Women Executives and Processes Related to Decision Accuracy," Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, No. 2 (April, 1979), p. 99.

[39]Page 100.

[40]Page 105, note 2.

[41]Page 102.

[42]Page 105, note 1.

[43]Page 102.

[44]Page 102.

[45]Page 103.

[46]Page 104.

[47]Brown, p. 283.

[48]Page 284.

[49]Olga Andruskin and Nancy J. Howes, "Dispelling a Myth: That Stereotypic Attitudes Influence Evaluations of Women as Administrators in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, [51], No. 5 (September/October, 1980), p. 476.

[50]Page 480.

NOTES (continued)

[51]Page 480.

[52]Page 480.

[53]Page 481.

[54]Page 482.

[55]Page 483.

[56]Page 485.

[57]Page 490.

[58]Laurie Larwood, Marion M. Wood and Sheila Davis Inderlied, "Training women for management: New problems, new solutions," Academy of Management Review, 3, No. 3 (July, 1978), p. 585.

[59]Page 586.

[60]Page 590.

[61]Robert W. Rice, Lisa Richer Bender and Alan G. Vetters, "Leader Sex, Follower Attitudes Toward Women and Leadership Effectiveness: A Laboratory Experiment," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 25, No. 1 (February, 1980), p. 46.

[62]Page 47.

[63]Page 48.

[64]Page 50.

[65]Page 50.

[66]Page 53.

[67]Page 53-54.

[68]Page 54.

[69]Page 55.

NOTES (continued)

[70]Page 61.

[71]Page 62.

[72]Page 64.

[73]Page 69.

[74]Page 71.

[75]Stephen L. Cohen and Sally Leavengood, "The Utility of the WAMS: Shouldn't it Relate to Discriminatory Behavior?" Academy of Management Journal, 21 (December, 1978), p. 742.

[76]Page 744.

[77]Page 745.

[78]Page 748.

[79]M. B. Weber, J. E. Feldman and E. C. Poling, "Why Women are Underrepresented in Educational Administration," Educational Leadership, 38, No. 4 (January, 1981), p. 320.

[80]Page 321.

[81]Page 321.

[82]Page 321.

[83]Brown, p. 284.

[84]Bartol, p. 809.

[85]Page 809, table I.

[86]Page 809, table I.

[87]Page 810.

[88]Page 811.

NOTES (continued)

[89]Andruskin and Howes, P. 478.

[90]Page 478.

[91]Page 478.

[92]Phyllis Rosser, "Women Fight 'Old Boys' for School Administrator Jobs," Learning, 8, (March, 1980), p. 32.

[93]Page 32.

[94]Page 31.

[95]Page 32.

[96]Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women," American Journal of Sociology, 82, No. 5, p. 967.

[97]Pages 965-966.

[98]Page 966.

[99]Page 966.

[100]Page 968.

[101]Page 973.

[102]Page 976.

[103]Page 978.

[104]Page 979.

[105]Page 988.

[106]Page 980.

[107]Page 984.

[108]Page 988.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andruskin, Olga and Nancy J. Howes. "Dispelling a Myth: That Stereotypic Attitudes Influence Evaluations of Women as Administrators in Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education, 51, No. 5 (September/October, 1980), 475-496.

Bartol, Kathryn M. "The Sex Structuring of Organizations: A Search for Possible Causes." Academy of Management Review, 3, No. 4 (October, 1978), 805-815.

Brown, Linda Keller. "Women and Business Management." Signs, 5, No. 2 (Winter, 1979), 266-288.

Cohen, Stephen L. and Sally Leavengood. "The Utility of the WAMS: Shouldn't it Relate to Discriminatory Behavior?" Academy of Management Journal, 21, No. 4 (December, 1978), 742-748.

Donnell, Susan M. and Jay Hall. "Men and Women as Managers: A Significant Difference." Organizational Dynamics, 8, No. 4 (Spring, 1980), 60-77.

Hyman, Beverly. "Responsive Leadership: The Woman Manager's Asset or Liability?" Supervisory Management, 25, No. 8 (August, 1980), 40-43.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." American Journal of Sociology, 82, No. 5, 965-990.

Kulczycky, Maria. "Women at the Top - Why so Few?" Savings and Loan News, 98, No. 6 (June, 1977), 68-73.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Larwood, Laurie, Marion M. Wood and Sheila Davis Inderlied. "Training Women for Management: New Problems, New Solutions." Academy of Management Review, 3, No. 3 (July, 1978), 584-593.

Milner, E. Keith, Harry A. King and Edward L. Pizzini. "Relationships Between Sex and Leadership Behavior of Department Heads in Physical Education." Research in Higher Education, 10, No. 2 (1979), 113-121.

Moore, Loretta M. and Annette U. Rickel. "Characteristics of Women in Traditional and Non-Traditional Managerial Roles." Personnel Psychology, 33, No. 2 (Summer, 1980), 317-333.

Muldrow, Tressie and James A. Bayton. "Men and Women Executives and Processes Related to Decision Accuracy." Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, No. 2 (April, 1979), 99-106.

Rice, Robert W., Lisa Richer Bender and Alan G. Vetters. "Leader Sex, Follower Attitudes Toward Women Leadership Effectiveness: A Laboratory Experiment." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 25, No. 1, (February, 1980), 46-78.

Rosser, Phyllis. "Women Fight Against 'Old Boys' for School Administrator Jobs." Learning, 8, (March, 1980), 30-34.

Weber, M. B., J. R. Feldman and E. C. Poling. "Why Women are Underrepresented in Educational Administration." Educational Leadership, 38, No. 4 (January, 1981), 320-322.